



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

is the hitherto much underrated Drama, "Lust's Dominion, or the Lascivious Queen" (The Spanish Moor's Tragedy), which is treated at length in the Appendix and its connection with "*Titus Andronicus*," "Othello" and "Richard III." pointed out.

A very instructive review of this book by Prof. Brandt has appeared in the *Göttingischen Gelehrten Anzeigen* of Sept. 1891, pp. 708-728, in which Schröer's investigations of the "Typische Charaktere" are continued.

H. A. RENNERT.

University of Pennsylvania.

ENGLISH POETRY.

The Poems of William Dunbar, edited with Introductions, Various Readings and Notes, by J. SCHIPPER, Ph. D., Parts i and ii. Published by the Kaiserliche Akademie der Wissenschaften, Vienna, 1891. 4to, pp. 197.

A critical review of this work will be in place when all its parts are issued; for the present, we must call attention to the admirable plan, and to the accurate work so far laid before us.

English is used throughout in the notes and explanations, as well as in the introduction (Part i) which contains a careful bibliography and plentiful critical material. The text is a piece of luxury, in large, clear type, with ample margins about the quarto page; and the explanatory notes justify the adjective, being historical and comparative as well as philological. Admirable, also, are the remarks prefixed to each poem; such an introduction to the famous "Flying of Dunbar with Kennedy" covers ten pages.

The order of the poems is mainly that followed in Schipper's excellent work, 'William Dunbar, Sein Leben und seine Gedichte,' Berlin, 1884. In this earlier volume, our author showed himself well fitted for his task, giving us an adequate and sympathetic sketch of a poet too often neglected by scholars and too little known by the public. This present edition of Dunbar reflects credit not only upon the scholar who has undertaken it, but also upon the learned body which puts it forth; and it only does justice, luxurious as all its appointments are, to the worth of a poet who alone

among the disciples of Chaucer was worthy to take the laurel from his master's brow.

FRANCIS B. GUMMERE.

Haverford College.

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE ANGLO-SAXON *gïen(a), gïel(a).*

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES:

SIRS: In the MOD. LANG. NOTES for February, Prof. Hart, referring to a communication of mine to the London *Academy* of December 19, states that he doubts if the masc. forms *gïen gïena* can be found in "genuine Wessex texts," and is hence led "to infer that the word is confined to Northern speech," and that I, therefore, "have no right to use a Wessex **gïen* (**gïena*) in support of [my] theory."

Prof. Hart really challenges Sievers to give his "authority" for the use of the forms in his grammar. Prof. Sievers will doubtless answer for himself, but as Prof. Hart seems to imply that I must have gotten the forms from Sievers' grammar, I take it upon myself to reply to his communication.

I am not aware that the forms *gïen gïena* occur in pure W.S. texts. But Grein records seven cases of *gïen* and one of *gïena*, to which should be added, as Prof. Hart suggests, *gïna* "El." 1070, Grein retaining here Thorpe's error, *gena*. We have all learned that it would not do to use the mixed speech of the poetical texts as a basis for grammar-making; but now that the laws of sound-change have been made pretty clear, for W.S. at least, have we no right to make use of the light they shed upon the forms of the poetical text? When in these texts, among the many W.S. forms that are familiar to us from the reading of prose texts, we come upon a form that answers all the requirements of W.S. genuineness, are we to drop it when we find it does not happen to have come down to us in prose texts? In O.E. poetry we have preserved a goodly number of antique words and forms, which the writers of the time were familiar with, but did not use in prose. Surely, Prof. Hart would not assign all these to non-W.S. dialects, particular when they have good W.S. form.

My position is this; not only neuter forms (*giet*, etc.) but also masc. forms (*gien*, etc.) were familiar to West-Saxons, but the masc. forms (as I expressly stated in my communication to the *Academy*) early went out of use in the South, just as they in time did in the North.

That Prof. Hart does not find the word "in any shape in Sweet's O.E.T." does not prove that *gien(a)* was not in use among the West-Saxons at the time the O.E.T. were written, Sweet does not record any masc. forms, and the neut. forms he reports are in the Mercian V.P. In order to prove that *gien giena* were not in use among the West Saxons when the oldest W.S. prose texts were written, it would be necessary to show that there was in these texts occasion for the use of a word signifying 'still,' and that in these cases some other word was employed. This is not true of the little W.S. contained in the O.E.T., but is true of the texts covered by Cosijn. Such a test as Prof. Hart proposes, would come nigh proving that *gieta* is not a W.S. form: Sweet does not give it in his O.E.T.; it is not cited by Cosijn; it is late in the Chronicle, etc.

If *gien giena* are not W.S. forms, I, for one, shall be very glad to have Prof. Hart (who is the first to question the matter) tell us what they are. Should we apply his test, they cannot belong to *any* dialect, for he does not seem to have succeeded in finding them in non-W.S. prose texts either. Should we try to explain them away by saying they are W.S. adaptations of northern *gēn gēon*, etc., we are surely getting on very uncertain ground; moreover, the combinations *gē-* and *gēo-* were as familiar to W.S. scribes as *gie-* was.

Now that Prof. Hart has transferred the discussion of the word 'yet' to the columns of the MOD. LANG. NOTES, it may be in place for me to supplement here what I wrote to the *Academy*.¹

Similar to the use of *hina dag* and *und hita*, **gēohine* and **gēohit*, we have *oð ðisne deg* Bede 418, 20, and *nugena oð þis* 110, 13; 420, 25.

It will be observed that I offered with some hesitation an explanation of the *-a* of *gieta giena* etc., suggesting that

1. The '*pana pata*' in the *Academy* are, of course, misprinted for *pana pata*, as is also 'Germanic *in*, *in-hino*, *in-hiio*' in MOD. LANG. NOTES, for *iu*, etc.

"the forms in *-a* might be wholly due to the analogy of the numerous other temporal adverbs in *-a*, or the way might have been led by forms in *-e*, like *hine*."

I would now suggest what seems to me, at least for *gieta*, a more satisfactory explanation. In Miller's edition of Bede I find *gyta* occurring three times (104, 32; 210, 3; 246, 15) and each time with an accent over the *-a*. This I observed with no other adverb in *-a*, nor, in fact, in the case of any unstressed vowel. If the *-a*, is long, it cannot be old in this position. Nor can its quantity be due to lengthening in final position (Sievers § 121,) for that applies only to stressed vowels; we should, in fact, look for shortening, especially in a word that is apt to become weak, just as *ealswá > eals(w)a*, later *alse* 'as.' May not the word be a conglomeration of *giet* and *á* 'ever,' which, exactly like German *noch immer*, could easily have come to mean no more than *giet* alone?

The idea that *gien* 'still, again' may perhaps have become confused with and absorbed by (on)*gén < géan < gægn* 'again,' must be abandoned; for at the time that *gien* disappeared, *ongéan* had made but little progress in the direction of 'again'; see the 'Oxford Dictionary' under 'again.'

I am not aware that attention has been called to the fact that in the early literature the temporal 'still' is rarely expressed by *giet* or *gien* alone, but that in the past *págiæt* is used, and in the present *núgiæt* or *giet todæge*, less often *giet oð þisne dæg*. The two latter expressions are clearly emphatic, but it would be very difficult to find in the *þa* and *nu* any force other than that of the tense, which is also expressed by the verb. At times one might translate *pagiæt* 'then still,' and *nugiet* 'now still' or 'even now,' but I know of no case where 'still' or 'yet' is not fully as satisfactory, and in the great majority of cases this is the only admissible translation. Indeed, *nugiet* may, like simple *giet*, be strengthened by *todæge* (Orosius 72, 10; 108, 19; Bede 262, 9.)

In the Orosius, including the passage from the Cot. MS., the temporal 'still' is expressed 18 times by *pagiæt*, 9 times by *nugiet*, 6 times by *giet todæge* and *giet oð þisne dæg*,—in all 33 times to 5 times *giet* alone (all five present tense). Bede shows (though I may, of course, have overlooked some) 10 (1 *git*, 9 *gen*) *todæge*

forms, 15 *nu* (1 *get*, 2 *gyt*, 6 *gen*, 6 *gena*) forms, 39 *pa* (2 *get*, 2 *geta*, 11 *gyt*, 3 *gyta*, 5 *gen*, 16 *gena*) forms, or 64 compound forms to 4 (2 *gyt*, 1 *gen* *æghwylce geara*, 1 *þonne gena*) that could be construed as simple forms. In the 'Blickling Homilies' we see a decrease in the proportion, but there are still three times as many full forms as simple ones: no *todæge* forms!, 7 *nu* (3 *git*, 3 *get*, 1 *git*) forms, 11 *pa* (8 *gyt*, one each *giet*, *git*, *get*) forms, in all 18 to 6 (5 *gyt*, 2 present, 2 future, 1 past; 1 *oft gita*) simple forms. In Ælfric's 'Lives of the Saints' vol. I, but few full forms remain, —7 (5 *pagit*, 2 *nugit*) to about 9 *git*'s; while in Byrhtferð's 'Handboc' not one of the 18 instances of the use of the word shows a *nu*, *pa*, or *todæge*.

In the above statistics (except in the case of Byrhtferð) I have limited myself to cases where the word has pretty clearly the temporal 'still' idea. This meaning was plainly the original one, and other meanings are very rare in the early texts. One of the first shades is that of 'for the last time,' 'before he died' (Bede 338, 27; 438, 6). Then that of 'again' or 'even' before *þridan siðe*, etc. (Orosius 82, 7, etc). Even early texts show *giet* with comparatives (Bede 5, Orosius 2), and in the Orosius we find two cases of *pagiet* so used (78, 18; 162, 30). The concessive idea, 'yet,' 'nevertheless,' seems to be late; Byrhtferð has numerous cases of it (5, 20; 48, 4, etc.), but of the earlier texts I find only a few cases in the Orosius that approximate this notion (30, 17; 136, 11). The tendency to place the word at the head of the clause (Orosius 62, 9,) increases with its occurrence in the concessive sense (Byrhtferð *gyt* 5, 20, 187, 9, *andgyt* 48, 4; 150, 14).

A writer's use of *giet* might form a test of authorship, time, or locality; observe the proportion: Bede 64-7, Orosius 33-5, 'Blickling' 18-6, Ælfric 7-9, Byrhtferð 0-18; also Bede's 75 cases (in all senses) to Ælfric's 18, in about the same number of pages.

GEORGE HEMPL.

University of Michigan.

ANGLO-SAXON *gien*, *giēna*.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES:

SIRS:—In further consideration of Professor Hempl's very interesting etymology of O. E. *gēn*, *gēt*, etc. (*London Academy*, Dec. 19, 1891)

to which exception was taken by Prof. Hart in MOD. LANG. NOTES for February, so far as concerned W. S. *gien*, let me call attention to the forms which these words assume in one important set of prose texts, viz., the "Gospel of Matthew" in four O.E. dialects (ed. by Skeat, 1887):—

North. (Cotton MS.) *geonæ* 12.46; *get* *ī geana* 15.16; *geana* 18.16; *geona* 19.20; *nis ða geon* (nondum est) 24.6; *ge* *ī geona* 27.63; and (added by Prof. Hempl) *gett* *ī geana* 17.5; *get* 26.65.

Mercian (Rushworth) *gen*¹ 19.20; *get* 24.6; 27.63; *geta* 15.16; 18.16; 24.24.

W.S. (Corpus MS.) *gyt* 12.46; 15.16; 17.5; 18.16; 19.20; 24.6.

Kt. (Hatton MS.) *geat* 12.46; *geot* 15.16; 24.6; *gēt* 17.5; *gyt* 18.16; 19.20.

(Royal MS. 1. A. xiv.) *gyt* 15.16; 24.6; *get* 19.20; *geat* 17.5.

It appears from the above that Old North. as represented in this text has regularly (7 times) the diphthong *eo* (*ea*) in the form with *n*, and *e* in the form with *t* (3 or 4? times, *ge* probably for *get*).

Bouterwek in his glossary gives several other cases of the form in *n*, and always with the diphthong *eo* (*ea*).

Sievers (Gr. § 157.2) refers this Old North. *geona* to *u-*, *o-* umlaut (§ 160) and yet writes it *géona*, in spite of the fact that *u-*, *o-* umlaut does not affect long vowels (cf. § 103 ff. and § 160). If this be the true explanation it would be necessary to assume an original short vowel, or the shortening of a long vowel not to be expected in this case (cf. § 125). On metrical grounds Sievers has shown, moreover, that *géna* has a long vowel (cf. *Beiträge*, x, 500).

Professor Hempl's theory proposes to account for the Northern *eo* (*ea*) by assuming that the following *h* is here not "affective," while in *gén*, *géna* it has its usual effect (cf. Sievers, Gr. § 165, or for short *eo*, § 164). But if this is the true explanation, then *gén*, *géna* should be Northern forms, and *geon* *géona* Mercian; for it is in Mercian that *h* is not always "affective," (cf. Sievers, id., and my Diss. on

¹ These words were omitted from my dissertation on the Rushworth Matthew, at the last moment, for further consideration.